



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/528,017

12/08/2005

Karl Pfahler

095309.56028US

9291

23911 7590 06/30/2008
CROWELL & MORING LLP
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP
P.O. BOX 14300
WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300

EXAMINER

EDELL, JOSEPH F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3636

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/30/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/528,017	Applicant(s) PFAHLER ET AL.	
	Examiner Joseph F. Edell	Art Unit 3636	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08 April 2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In addition, Claims 4-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly

connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 1 recites that a network of grooves “define [sic] rows and columns of groove intersection points.” However, the specification does not reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that Applicant had possession of this subject matter at the time of filing. Moreover, the specification does not describe this subject matter in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "the at least one shaft" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 4, 5, 8, and 9, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by PCT Publication No. WO 03/051666 A1 to Huo et al.

Huo et al. discloses a cushion that includes all the limitations recited in claims 4, 5, 8, and 9, as best understood. Huo et al. show a cushion having a cushion core 4 (see Fig. 1) made of a foam material, an air-permeable and moisture-permeable covering layer 7 which the cushion core is lined, a set of longitudinally extending grooves (along longitudinal portions of ducts 18,19), a set of transversely extending grooves (along transverse portions of ducts 18,19) defined between the cushion core and the covering layer to form a network of grooves together with the set of transversely extending grooves, channels 9,22 passing through an entire core thickness of the cushion core, a first end of each channel opening into the network of grooves at the intersection points, a second end of each channel opening out freely on an outer face of the cushion core directed away from the grooves, a miniature fan 12,17 that sucks air in from an area surrounding the cushion to provide air flow out through the second ends of at least some of the channels, a mouth positioned in an intersection area of one of the longitudinal grooves and one of the transverse grooves, and at least one shaft 9 in the cushion core opening out into the network of grooves and open on an outer face of the cushion core directed away from the network of grooves wherein the network of grooves are spaced apart from one another and define rows and columns of groove intersection points that are open toward the covering layers and through which air is forced, and the fan is arranged in the shaft.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-9, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,866,800 to Bedford in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,179,706 B1 to Yoshinori et al.

Bedford discloses a cushion that is basically the same as that recited in claims 4-9, as best understood, except that the cushion lacks sets of grooves and a covering layer, as recited in the claims. See Figures 1-3 of Bedford for the teaching that the cushion has a cushion core 11,13 made of a foam material, grooves formed by valley 19 defined between the cushion and the covering layer, channels 23 passing through an entire core thickness of the cushion core, a first end of each channel opening into the grooves, a second end of each channel opening out freely on an outer face of the cushion core directed away from the grooves, a miniature fan 27 that sucks air in from an area surrounding the cushion to provide air flow out through the second ends of at least some of the channels, and at least one shaft (near cutout 25) in the cushion core opening out into the grooves and open on an outer face of the cushion core directed away from the grooves.

Yoshinori et al. show a cushion similar to that of Bedford wherein the cushion has a cushion core 8 (see Fig. 1), an air-permeable and moisture-permeable covering layer

Art Unit: 3636

9,10 which the cushion core is lined, a set of longitudinally extending grooves (along transverse portions of passages 13), a set of transversely extending grooves (along transverse portions of passages 13) defined between the cushion core and the covering layer to form a network of grooves together with the set of transversely extending grooves, a mouth positioned in an intersection area of one of the longitudinal grooves and one of the transverse grooves, a support 9 of the covering layer made of foam, and an air-permeable lining stretching across the support 10. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cushion of Bedford to include an air-permeable and moisture-permeable covering layer which the cushion core is lined and having a support made of reticulated foam and an air-permeable lining stretching across the support, and the grooves are replaced with a set of longitudinally extending grooves and a set of transversely extending grooves defined between the cushion core and the covering layer to form a network of grooves together with the set of transversely extending grooves wherein a mouth is positioned in an intersection area of one of the longitudinal grooves and one of the transverse grooves, such as the cushion disclosed by Yoshinori et al. One would have been motivated to make such a modification in view of the suggestion in Yoshinori et al. that the network of grooves immediately provides cooling comfort with less air loss via interconnected passages, and in view of the knowledge generally available to one skilled in the art that a covering layer provides an aesthetically pleasing and comfortable seating arrangement.

Claims 4-9, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,196,627 B1 to Faust et al. in view of Yoshinori et al.

Faust et al. disclose a cushion that is basically the same as that recited in claims 4-9, as best understood, except that the cushion lacks sets of grooves, as recited in the claims. See Figures 1 and 1A of Faust et al. for the teaching that the cushion has a cushion core 22 made of a foam material, an air-permeable and moisture-permeable covering layer lining the cushion core and including a support 23,24,26 made of reticulated foam and an air-permeable lining 25 stretching across the support, passages in layer 23 defined between the cushion and the covering layer, channels 30 passing through an entire core thickness of the cushion core, a first end of each channel opening into the passages, a second end of each channel opening out freely on an outer face of the cushion core directed away from the channels, a miniature fan 29 that sucks air in from an area surrounding the cushion to provide air flow out through the second ends of at least some of the channels, and at least one shaft 32 in the cushion core opening out into the grooves and open on an outer face of the cushion core directed away from the grooves.

Yoshinori et al. show a cushion similar to that of Faust et al. wherein the cushion has a cushion core 8 (see Fig. 1), a set of longitudinally extending grooves (along transverse portions of passages 13), a set of transversely extending grooves (along transverse portions of passages 13) defined between the cushion core and the covering layer to form a network of grooves together with the set of transversely extending

grooves, and a mouth positioned in an intersection area of one of the longitudinal grooves and one of the transverse grooves. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cushion of Faust et al. to include a set of longitudinally extending grooves and a set of transversely extending grooves defined between the cushion core and the covering layer to form a network of grooves together with the set of transversely extending grooves wherein a mouth is positioned in an intersection area of one of the longitudinal grooves and one of the transverse grooves, such as the cushion disclosed by Yoshinori et al. One would have been motivated to make such a modification in view of the suggestion in Yoshinori et al. that the network of grooves immediately provides cooling comfort with less air loss via interconnected passages.

Claims 6 and 7, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huo et al. in view of Yoshinori et al.

Huo et al. disclose a cushion that is basically the same as that recited in claims 6 and 7, as best understood, except that the covering layer lacks a support and a lining, as recited in the claims. Yoshinori et al. show a cushion similar to that of Bedford wherein the cushion has a cushion core 8 (see Fig. 1), and an air-permeable and moisture-permeable covering layer 9,10 which the cushion core is lined, a support 9 of the covering layer made of foam, and an air-permeable lining stretching across the support 10. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cushion of Huo et al. such that the covering layer includes a support made of reticulated foam and an air-permeable lining

stretching across the support, such as the cushion disclosed by Yoshinori et al. One would have been motivated to make such a modification in view of the suggestion in Yoshinori et al. that the surface provide a spongy surface and the lining provides a moquette covering.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4-9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph F. Edell whose telephone number is (571) 272-6858. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8:30am-5:00pm.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/528,017

Page 10

Art Unit: 3636

/Joseph F Edell/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3636

June 30, 2008